

<p>Attorney or Party Name, Address, Telephone & FAX Nos., State Bar No. & Email Address</p> <p>Joseph E. Caceres, Esq. (SBN 169164) Charles Shamash, Esq. (SBN 178110) CACERES & SHAMASH, LLP 8200 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 400 Beverly Hills, California 90211 Tel: (310) 205-3400 Fax: (310) 878-8308 Email: cs@locs.com</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Individual appearing without attorney <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attorney for: Debtor</p>		<p>FOR COURT USE ONLY</p>	
<p>UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SANTA ANA DIVISION</p>			
<p>In re:</p> <p>ZIA SHLAIMOUN,</p> <p>Debtor(s).</p>		<p>CASE NO.: 8:17-bk-10976-TA CHAPTER: 7</p> <p>NOTICE OF MOTION FOR: DEBTOR'S MOTION TO DISMISS CASE; DECLARATIONS OF ZIA SHLAIMOUN AND CHARLES SHAMASH IN SUPPORT THEREOF</p> <p><i>(Specify name of Motion)</i></p> <p>DATE: 05/23/2017 TIME: 11:00 am COURTROOM: 5B PLACE: United States Bankruptcy Court 411 West Fourth Street Santa Ana, CA 92701</p>	

1. TO (*specify name*): All Creditors and Other Interested Parties
2. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on the following date and time and in the indicated courtroom, Movant in the above-captioned matter will move this court for an Order granting the relief sought as set forth in the Motion and accompanying supporting documents served and filed herewith. Said Motion is based upon the grounds set forth in the attached Motion and accompanying documents.
3. **Your rights may be affected.** You should read these papers carefully and discuss them with your attorney, if you have one. (If you do not have an attorney, you may wish to consult one.)

4. **Deadline for Opposition Papers:** This Motion is being heard on regular notice pursuant to LBR 9013-1. If you wish to oppose this Motion, you must file a written response with the court and serve a copy of it upon the Movant or Movant's attorney at the address set forth above no less than fourteen (14) days prior to the above hearing date. If you fail to file a written response to this Motion within such time period, the court may treat such failure as a waiver of your right to oppose the Motion and may grant the requested relief.
5. **Hearing Date Obtained Pursuant to Judge's Self-Calendaring Procedure:** The undersigned hereby verifies that the above hearing date and time were available for this type of Motion according to the judge's self-calendaring procedures.

Date: 04/19/2017

CACERES & SHAMASH, LLP
Printed name of law firm

/s/ Charles Shamash
Signature

Charles Shamash, Esq.
Printed name of attorney

Joseph E. Caceres, Esq. (SBN169164)
Charles Shamash, Esq. (SBN 178110)
CACERES & SHAMASH, LLP
8200 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 400
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Phone: (310) 205-3400
Fax: (310) 878-8308
Email: cs@locs.com

Attorneys for Debtor

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA ANA DIVISION

In re) Case No. 8:17-bk-10976-TA
ZIA SHLAIMOUN,) Chapter 7
)
) **DEBTOR'S MOTION TO DISMISS**
) **CASE; DECLARATIONS OF ZIA**
) **SHLAIMOUN AND CHARLES**
) **SHAMASH IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

Debtor(s).) Date: May 23, 2017
) Time: 11:00 a.m.
) Ctrm: 5B
) 411 West Fourth Street
) Santa Ana, CA 92701

**TO THE HONORABLE THEODOR C. ALBERT, UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY
JUDGE, THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE, AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:**

ZIA SHLAIMOUN ("Debtor") hereby moves this Court for an order dismissing this case
pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 707(a) and 305(a)(1). In support thereof, Debtor respectfully submits
the following:

//

//

//

//

I.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND FACTS

1. Debtor commenced this case with the filing of a voluntary petition under Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code on March 15, 2017. See Request for Judicial Notice (“RFJN”) filed concurrently herewith, Exhibit 1 thereto (copy of Court’s docket). At the time of filing, Debtor was involved in litigation with more than one party (the main two, Amy Hsiao and Hybrid Finance, Ltd., are discussed below), and believed he could reorganize his debt under Chapter 13.

2. On or about March 28, 2017, Caceres & Shamash, LLP (“C&S”) substituted into the case in place and stead of prior counsel. See RFJN, Exhibit 1 [Docket No. 25].

3. Following counsel’s initial consultation with Debtor, Debtor realized that he would not be able to reorganize under Chapter 13. However, he did believe he had a valid option to purchase certain real estate (arising out of the litigation with Amy Hsiao) that could be administered for the benefit of creditors, although Hsiao disputed that. Hence, the Debtor’s Notice of Conversion to Chapter 7 was filed on March 28, 2017 [Docket No. 26], after which Thomas H. Casey was appointed as trustee (“Trustee”) [Docket No. 32]. See RFJN, Exhibit 1. Trustee, however, ultimately determined not to pursue the option.¹

4. As alluded to above, the other main party in litigation with the Debtor at the time the case was filed was Hybrid Finance, Ltd. (“Hybrid”). As the Court knows, Hybrid also filed a Motion for Relief from Automatic Stay (Action in Non-Bankruptcy Forum) (“Hybrid MFRAS”), on March 28, 2017 (“Hybrid MFRAS”) [Docket No. 28]. Debtor filed an opposition thereto on

¹The Court is familiar with the disputed option being referred to here. As the Court will recall, Amy Hsiao filed a Motion for Relief from Automatic Stay (Action in Non-Bankruptcy Forum) (“Hsiao MFRAS”) on March 23, 2017 [Docket No. 18]. Debtor filed an opposition thereto on the basis of his belief that he had a valid purchase option that the chapter 7 trustee, when appointed, should have the right to review before the matter moved forward [Docket No. 27]. After the Court continued the matter for a brief period in order to allow such review [Docket No. 36 and 37], Trustee filed a Non-Opposition to the Hsiao MFRAS [Docket No. 42]. In that non-opposition, Trustee indicated that he had reviewed the motion, the Debtor’s opposition, and documents submitted by both parties; that he had discussed the matter with both parties; that he was not asserting an interest in the disputed option on behalf of the Estate; and that he did not oppose relief from stay. Id. The Hsiao MFRAS was thereafter granted by order entered April 5, 2017 [Docket No. 45]. See RFJN, Exhibits 2-6 thereto (copies of the Hsiao MFRAS (without exhibits), Debtor’s opposition, the Interim Order continuing the motion, Trustee’s non-opposition, and the Court’s order granting the Hsiao MFRAS, respectively).

1 the basis that it appeared Trustee had not been served with the motion (given that he had been
2 appointed just after it was filed), and to ensure that upon granting of the motion the stay would
3 remain as to enforcement of any resulting judgment [Docket No. 50]. Trustee later stipulated to
4 relief from stay with Hybrid [Docket No. 52], and the Court ultimately granted the Hybrid
5 MFRAS by order entered April 18, 2017 [Docket No. 56]. See RFJN, Exhibits 7-10 thereto
6 (copies of the Hybrid MFRAS (without exhibits), Debtor's opposition, the Stipulation between
7 Trustee and Hybrid, and the Court's order granting the Hsiao MFRAS, respectively).

8 5. Given the foregoing, Debtor has decided to seek dismissal of the case. With regard
9 to the disputed option in the Hsiao case, Trustee will not be pursuing it and Hsiao is free to pursue
10 her state court rights and remedies pursuant to the relief from stay order she obtained (and in fact
11 continued with their state court matter thereafter, although Debtor voluntarily vacated the house
12 and is now living in a hotel). With regard to the Hybrid matter, Trustee did not oppose the Hybrid
13 MFRAS and there is no indication he is interested in pursuing anything related to that matter. In
14 any event, as with Hsiao, Hybrid is now free to pursue its state court rights and remedies.

15 6. C&S has discussed the matter with Trustee, and it appears that Trustee will not
16 oppose the motion to dismiss. All creditors will of course be free to pursue any remedies they
17 may have against Debtor unencumbered by the automatic stay or a discharge. Debtor also has no
18 opposition to a 180-day bar against refiling under Section 109(g) in connection with the dismissal,
19 so as to give creditors comfort that he does not intend to turn around and refile a case as soon as
20 this one is dismissed.

21 II.

22 DISCUSSION

23 A. This Case Should Be Dismissed Under 11 U.S.C. § 707(a)

24 11 U.S.C. § 707(a) provides that the court may dismiss a chapter 7 case for “cause.”²

25 ²The full text of Section 707(a) is as follows:

26 (a) The court may dismiss a case under this chapter only after notice and a hearing and only for
27 cause, including –

28 (1) unreasonable delay by the debtor that is prejudicial to creditors;
(2) nonpayment of any fees or charges required under chapter 123 of title 28; and

(continued...)

1 Although the full text of the section includes certain specific examples of “cause,” it is axiomatic
2 that the word “including” is not limiting, see 11 U.S.C. § 102(3),³ such that the grounds set forth
3 in Section 707(a) are not exhaustive, but merely illustrative. See, e.g., In re Dinova, 212 B.R.
4 437, 442 (2nd Cir. B.A.P. 1997); In re Atlas Supply Corporation, 857 F.2d 1061, 1063 (5th Cir.
5 1988). Hence, the Court need not find that one of the enumerated grounds set forth in Section
6 707(a) applies in order to find that cause exists to dismiss a case under that section. Rather, the
7 bankruptcy court must make this determination on a case-by-case basis. In re Dinova, 212 B.R. at
8 442. Moreover, the decision whether to grant a motion to dismiss lies within the sound discretion
9 of the bankruptcy judge, reversible only for an abuse of discretion. In re Atlas Supply
10 Corporation, 857 F.2d at 1063.

11 In the instant case, cause to dismiss exists because there is no reason for the case to remain
12 in bankruptcy other than for Debtor to obtain a discharge, and he is willingly dismissing the case
13 with the full understanding that if the case is dismissed no discharge will be issued therein.
14 Moreover, it appears Trustee does not oppose dismissal. Finally, Debtor does not oppose a 180-
15 day bar against refiling under Section 109(g) in connection with the dismissal, so as to give
16 creditors comfort that he does not intend to turn around and refile a case as soon as this one is
17 dismissed. The case should therefore be dismissed under Section 707(a).

18 **B. This Case Also Should be Dismissed Under 11 U.S.C. § 305(a)(1)**

19 This Court also has authority to dismiss this Case under 11 U.S.C. §305(a)(1), which
20 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

21 (a) The court, after notice and a hearing, may dismiss a case under this title . . . at
22 any time if– (1) the interests of creditors and the debtor would be better served by
23 such dismissal

24 11 U.S.C. § 305(a)(1).

25
26 ²(...continued)

27 (3) failure of the debtor in a voluntary case to file, within fifteen days or such additional
28 time as the court may allow after the filing of the petition commencing such case, the
information required by paragraph (1) of section 521, but only on a motion by the
United States trustee.

³Section 102, entitled “Rules of Construction,” states in subsection 3 that “‘includes’ and
‘including’ are not limiting.”

1 The Bankruptcy Appellate Panel of the Ninth Circuit has stated that the test under this
2 section is “. . . not whether dismissal would give rise to a substantial prejudice to the debtor. Nor
3 is the test whether a balancing process favors dismissal. Rather, the test is whether both the debtor
4 and the creditors would be ‘better served’ by a dismissal.” In re Eastman, 188 B.R. 621, 624-25
5 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1995).

6 Dismissal is in the best interests of creditors because upon dismissal they will be free to
7 pursue any remedies they may have against Debtor unencumbered by the automatic stay or a
8 discharge. Indeed, the two main creditors/parties who have participated in this case, Hsiao and
9 Hybrid, have already sought and received relief from stay orders from the Court to do just that,
10 i.e., pursue their state court remedies. Dismissal is also in the best interests of Debtor for the
11 simple reason that he is seeking it and no longer wishes to remain in bankruptcy. Finally, it
12 appears Trustee does not oppose dismissal, and the Debtor does not oppose a 180-day bar to
13 refile. The case should therefore be dismissed under Section 305(a)(1) as both Debtor and his
14 creditors would be ‘better served’ by a dismissal.

15 **III.**

16 **CONCLUSION**

17 For all of the foregoing reasons, the Case should be dismissed.

18
19 **WHEREFORE**, Debtors respectfully request that the Court (1) dismiss this case, and (2)
20 grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

21
22 Dated: April 19, 2017

Respectfully Submitted,

23 CACERES & SHAMASH, LLP

24
25 By: /s/ Charles Shamash
26 Joseph E. Caceres, Esq.
Charles Shamash, Esq.
Attorneys for Debtors
27
28

DECLARATION OF ZIA SHLAIMOUN

I, Zia Shlaimoun, do hereby declare as follows:

1. I am the debtor in this case. I am over the age of 18. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein and if called as a witness could and would competently testify thereto.

2. I commenced this case with the filing of a voluntary petition under Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code on March 15, 2017. See Request for Judicial Notice (“RFJN”) filed concurrently herewith, Exhibit 1 thereto (copy of Court’s docket). At the time of filing, I as involved in litigation with more than one party (the main two, Amy Hsiao and Hybrid Finance, Ltd., are discussed below), and believed I could reorganize my debt under Chapter 13.

3. On or about March 28, 2017, Caceres & Shamash, LLP (“C&S”) substituted into the case in place and stead of prior counsel. See RFJN, Exhibit 1 [Docket No. 25].

4. Following my initial consultation with C&S, I realized that I would not be able to reorganize under Chapter 13. However, I did believe I had a valid option to purchase certain real estate (arising out of the litigation with Amy Hsiao) that could be administered for the benefit of creditors, although Hsiao disputed that. Hence, my Notice of Conversion to Chapter 7 was filed on March 28, 2017 [Docket No. 26], after which Thomas H. Casey was appointed as trustee (“Trustee”) [Docket No. 32]. See RFJN, Exhibit 1. Trustee, however, ultimately determined not to pursue the option.⁴

5. As alluded to above, the other main party in litigation with me at the time the case was filed was Hybrid Finance, Ltd. (“Hybrid”). As the Court knows, Hybrid also filed a Motion for Relief from Automatic Stay (Action in Non-Bankruptcy Forum) (“Hybrid MFRAS”), on March

⁴The Court is familiar with the disputed option being referred to here. As the Court will recall, Amy Hsiao filed a Motion for Relief from Automatic Stay (Action in Non-Bankruptcy Forum) (“Hsiao MFRAS”) on March 23, 2017 [Docket No. 18]. I filed an opposition thereto on the basis of my belief that I had a valid purchase option that the chapter 7 trustee, when appointed, should have the right to review before the matter moved forward [Docket No. 27]. After the Court continued the matter for a brief period in order to allow such review [Docket No. 36 and 37], Trustee filed a Non-Opposition to the Hsiao MFRAS [Docket No. 42]. In that non-opposition, Trustee indicated that he had reviewed the motion, my opposition, and documents submitted by both parties; that he had discussed the matter with both parties; that he was not asserting an interest in the disputed option on behalf of the Estate; and that he did not oppose relief from stay. Id. The Hsiao MFRAS was thereafter granted by order entered April 5, 2017 [Docket No. 45]. See RFJN, Exhibits 2-6 thereto (copies of the Hsiao MFRAS (without exhibits), my opposition, the Interim Order continuing the motion, Trustee’s non-opposition, and the Court’s order granting the Hsiao MFRAS, respectively).


1 28, 2017 ("Hybrid MFRAS") [Docket No. 28]. I filed an opposition thereto on the basis that it
2 appeared Trustee had not been served with the motion (given that he had been appointed just after
3 it was filed), and to ensure that upon granting of the motion the stay would remain as to
4 enforcement of any resulting judgment [Docket No. 50]. Trustee later stipulated to relief from stay
5 with Hybrid [Docket No. 52], and the Court ultimately granted the Hybrid MFRAS by order
6 entered April 18, 2017 [Docket No. 56]. See RFJN, Exhibits 7-10 thereto (copies of the Hybrid
7 MFRAS, my opposition, the Stipulation between Trustee and Hybrid, and the Court's order
8 granting the Hsiao MFRAS, respectively).

9 6. Given the foregoing, I have decided to seek dismissal of the case. With regard to
10 the disputed option in the Hsiao case, Trustee will not be pursuing it and Hsiao is free to pursue
11 her state court rights and remedies pursuant to the relief from stay order she obtained (and in fact
12 continued with their state court matter thereafter, although I voluntarily vacated the house and am
13 now living in a hotel). With regard to the Hybrid matter, Trustee did not oppose the Hybrid
14 MFRAS and there is no indication he is interested in pursuing anything related to that matter. In
15 any event, as with Hsaio, Hybrid is now free to pursue its state court rights and remedies.

16 7. I am informed and believe that C&S has discussed the matter with Trustee, and it
17 appears that Trustee will not oppose the motion to dismiss. All creditors will of course be free to
18 pursue any remedies they may have against me unencumbered by the automatic stay or a
19 discharge. I also have no opposition to a 180-day bar against refiling under Section 109(g) in
20 connection with the dismissal, so as to give creditors comfort that I do not intend to turn around
21 and refile a case as soon as this one is dismissed.

22 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

23 Executed on April 19, 2017 at Irvine, California.

24 
25 Zia Shlaimoun
26
27
28

DECLARATION OF CHARLES SHAMASH

I, Charles Shamash, do hereby declare as follows:

1. My firm, Caceres & Shamash, LLP, is counsel for the Debtor in this case. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the courts of the State of California and in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. I am over the age of 18. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration, except where stated to be on information and belief, and if called to testify could and would testify competently thereto.

2. I downloaded all of the following documents from the Court's PACER system, and true and correct copies of the following documents are attached to the Request for Judicial Notice in support of this motion being filed concurrently herewith:

EXHIBIT 1 - COURT'S PACER DOCKET

EXHIBIT 2 - AMY HSIAO MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY (ACTION NON-BANKRUPTCY FORUM) filed March 23, 2017 [Docket No. 18]
(without exhibits)

EXHIBIT 3 - DEBTOR'S OPPOSITION TO HSIAO MFRAS filed March 28, 2017 [Docket No. 27]

EXHIBIT 4 - INTERIM ORDER CONTINUING HEARING ON HSIAO MFRAS entered March 30, 2017 [Docket No. 36]

EXHIBIT 5 - TRUSTEE'S NON-OPPOSITION TO HSIAO MFRAS filed April 4, 2017 [Docket No. 42]

EXHIBIT 6 - COURT'S ORDER GRANTING HSIAO MFRAS entered April 5, 2017 [Docket No. 45]

EXHIBIT 7 - HYBRID FINANCE, LTD. MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY (ACTION NON-BANKRUPTCY FORUM) filed March 28, 2017 [Docket No. 28]
(without exhibits)

EXHIBIT 8 - DEBTOR'S OPPOSITION TO HYBRID MFRAS filed April 10, 2017 [Docket No. 50]

EXHIBIT 9 - STIPULATION BETWEEN TRUSTEE AND HYBRID RE HYBRID MFRAS filed April 12, 2017 [Docket No. 52]

EXHIBIT 10- COURT'S ORDER GRANTING HYBRID MFRAS entered April 18, 2017 [Docket No. 56]

//

//

1 3. Prior to filing this motion I discussed the matter with Trustee, and it appears that
2 Trustee will not oppose the motion to dismiss. All creditors will of course be free to pursue any
3 remedies they may have against Debtor unencumbered by the automatic stay or a discharge.
4 Debtor also has no opposition to a 180-day bar against refiling under Section 109(g) in connection
5 with the dismissal, so as to give creditors comfort that he does not intend to turn around and refile
6 a case as soon as this one is dismissed.

7 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

8 Executed on April 19, 2017 at Beverly Hills, California.

9
10 /s/ Charles Shamash

11 _____
Charles Shamash
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE OF DOCUMENT

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding. My business address is:
8200 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 400, Beverly Hills, CA 90211

A true and correct copy of the foregoing documents entitled (*specify*): **Notice of Motion and Debtor's Motion to Dismiss Case: Declarations of Zia Shlaimoun and Charles Shamash in Support Thereof** will be served or was served (a) on the judge in chambers in the form and manner required by LBR 5005-2(d); and (b) in the manner stated below:

1. **TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF)**: Pursuant to controlling General Orders and LBR, the foregoing document will be served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On (date) **04/20/2017**, I checked the CM/ECF docket for this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding and determined that the following persons are on the Electronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at the email addresses stated below:

- Eric V Anderton eanderton@catanzarite.com, bphillips@catanzarite.com19
- Alan L. Armstrong alan@alanarmstrong.com
- Thomas H Casey (TR) msilva@tomcaseylaw.com, thc@trustesolutions.net
- Timothy P Dillon tdillon@dillongerardi.com, rabrera@dillongerardi.com
- Scott L Keehn scottk@keehnlaw.com, chrisf@keehnlaw.com
- Charles Shamash cs@locs.com, generalbox@locs.com
- Timothy J Silverman tsilverman@scheerlawgroup.com
- United States Trustee (SA) ustpregion16.sa.ecf@usdoj.gov
- Zann R Welch ecfnotices@ascensioncapitalgroup.com

☐ Service information continued on attached page

2. **SERVED BY UNITED STATES MAIL**:

On (date) **04/20/2017**, I served the following persons and/or entities at the last known addresses in this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope in the United States mail, first class, postage prepaid, and addressed as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that mailing to the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed.

Bankruptcy Judge:

The Honorable Theodor C. Albert, U.S. Bankruptcy Judge
United States Bankruptcy Court
411 West Fourth Street, Suite 5085
Santa Ana, CA 92701

All on attached list served via U.S. mail, with the exception of anyone on NEF list above

☒ Service information continued on attached page

3. **SERVED BY PERSONAL DELIVERY, OVERNIGHT MAIL, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OR EMAIL** (state method for each person or entity served): Pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 5 and/or controlling LBR, on (date) _____, I served the following persons and/or entities by personal delivery, overnight mail service, or (for those who consented in writing to such service method), by facsimile transmission and/or email as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that personal delivery on, or overnight mail to, the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed.

☐ Service information continued on attached page

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

04/20/17
Date

Charles Shamash
Type Name

/s/ Charles Shamash
Signature

Label Matrix for local noticing

0973-8

Case 8:17-bk-10976-TA

Central District of California

Santa Ana

Wed Apr 19 14:20:32 PDT 2017

Hybrid Finance, LTD.

Dillon Gerardi Hershberger Miller & Ahua

5872 OWENS AVE STE 200

CARLSBAD, CA 92008-5518

BMW Financial Services NA, LLC

c/o Ascension Capital Group

P.O. Box 165028

Irving, TX 75016-5028

Santa Ana Division

411 West Fourth Street, Suite 2030,

Santa Ana, CA 92701-4500

Daimler Trust

c/o BK Servicing, LLC

PO Box 131265

Roseville, MN 55113-0011

Account Management Ser

6101 Ball Rd Ste 207

Cypress, CA 90630-3965

Amex

P.O. Box 981537

El Paso, TX 79998-1537

(p)BANK OF AMERICA

PO BOX 982238

EL PASO TX 79998-2238

(p)BMW FINANCIAL SERVICES

CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTER

PO BOX 3608

DUBLIN OH 43016-0306

Chase Auto

Po Box 901003

Ft Worth, TX 76101-2003

Chase Card

Po Box 15298

Wilmington, DE 19850-5298

Designed Receivable So

1 Centerpointe Dr Ste 45

La Palma, CA 90623-1052

Dsnb Macys

9111 Duke Blvd

Mason, OH 45040-8999

Grant & Weber

26610 West Agoura Rd Ste

Calabasas, CA 91302-2975

Malibu Urgent Care

Acct Management Services, Inc

PO Box 2296

Cypress, CA 90630-1796

Mb Fin Svcs

13650 Heritage Pkwy

Fort Worth, TX 76177-5323

Nordstrom/td

13531 E Caley Ave

Englewood, CO 80111-6505

Toyota Motor Credit Co

440 E Huntington Dr Ste

Arcadia, CA 91006-3776

United States Trustee (SA)

411 W Fourth St., Suite 7160

Santa Ana, CA 92701-4500

Verizon Wireless

Po Box 49

Lakeland, FL 33802-0049

Wells Fargo

Po Box 14517

Des Moines, IA 50306-3517

Wffnb Retail

Po Box 94498

Las Vegas, NV 89193-4498

Amy Hsiao

c/o L. Scott Keehn

Keehn Law Group, APC

501 W. Broadway, Ste. 1025

San Diego, CA 92101-3546

Charles Shamash

Caceres & Shamash LLP

8200 Wilshire Blvd Ste 400

Beverly Hills, CA 90211-2315

Thomas H Casey (TR)

22342 Avenida Empresa, Suite 200

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688-2148

Zia Shlaimoun

923 Canyon Creak

Irvine, CA 92603

Bankamerica
Po Box 982238
El Paso, TX 79998

Case 8:17-bk-10976-TA

Doc 57 Filed 04/20/17 Entered 04/20/17 10:00:53 Desc
Main Document Page 14 of 14

Bank of America
BMW Financial Services
5515 Parkcenter Cir
Dublin, OH 43017

The following recipients may be/have been bypassed for notice due to an undeliverable (u) or duplicate (d) address.

(u)Courtesy NEF

End of Label Matrix	
Mailable recipients	25
Bypassed recipients	1
Total	26